

Journal of Social Sciences (COES&RJ-JSS)

ISSN (E): 2305-9249 ISSN (P): 2305-9494

Publisher: Centre of Excellence for Scientific & Research Journalism, COES&RJ LLC

Online Publication Date: 1st January 2015

Online Issue: Volume 4, Number 1, January 2015

[http://www.centreofexcellence.net/J/JSS/JSS Mainpage.htm](http://www.centreofexcellence.net/J/JSS/JSS>Mainpage.htm)

**ON THE HISTORY OF THE RESEARCH OF OLD TURKIC ORHON
INSCRIPTIONS IN LINGUISTIC ASPECT**

Nurila Shaimerdinova

Doctor Philological Sciences, Professor

Aisulu Kupayeva

MA in Turkological Studies, PhD student

L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan

Abstract:

Since the discovery of Old Turkic Inscriptions scholars from different countries focus their concentration on the research of these inscriptions. However, the inscriptions are studied in different aspects. This paper gives the periodization of research history of the monuments and detailed description of each periods. The author of this paper attempts to give comparative analysis of research works on linguistic aspect of the inscriptions of the scholars who made a great contribution to the study of Old Turkic Manuscripts.

Citation:

Shaimerdinova, Nurila; Kupayeva, Aisulu (2015); On the history of the research of old Turkic Orhon Inscriptions in linguistic aspect; Journal of Social Sciences (COES&RJ-JSS), Vol.4, No.1, pp: 680-690.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.17632/3xddnxcstg.1>

Introduction

Valuable heritage of shared historical period of all Turkic peoples and the primitive Turkic runic writing have attracted the attention of all scholars from different countries, since Russian scientists as N. Vidzen, S. Remezov and a Sweden officer, who was exiled to Siberia, Philip Johan

Von Strahlenberg declared about stele with unknown writings along the rivers Orhon in Mongolia and Yenissei in Siberia. Turkic tribal federations living in the territory of Central Asia and Siberia during the V - VII centuries left a remarkable inheritance of runic written monuments to the following generation: the Orkhon-Yenisey and Talas runes (Saurykhov N., 2014: 167). Since the discovery of unknown signs on the stones found in the valley alongside the Orhon River in the territory of Mongolia, these inscriptions are studied in different aspects as well as these texts contain important historical, linguistic, cultural, geographical evidence of ancient times. The oldest Turkic written records are considered as valuable materials for reconstruction of Proto-Turkic language and establishment of genetic relations of modern Turkic languages.

As we stated above scholars have addressed to different aspects of the inscriptions. Consequently, in our research we try to distinguish the aspects of studies on inscriptions. The purpose of this paper is the general description of research history of Orhon Old Turkic monuments, periodization of research history and revealing specificity of research aspects in a definite period research. To achieve this purpose the following tasks are set:

- to give a short description of the texts of Orhon inscriptions;
- to describe the research history of Orhon monuments in linguistic aspect;
- to determine the periods of research in accordance with the specificity of research works conducted in that period;
- to consider specificity of research works on inscriptions;

In the history of research of Orhon Runic Inscriptions, some scholars distinguish five periods: 1. 1678-1820 –expeditions organized by Russian Empire for political purposes in which archeologists came across with the monuments. 2. 1820 to 1893- discovery of monuments and specially organized expeditions. 3. 1893 to 1945 – deciphering of the unknown runic writings, reading and translations of the texts and different hypothesis about the origin of this runes. 4. 1945 to 1991 studies on grammar and language of inscriptions, 5. The last period from 1991 up to now studies post-soviet period (Yesskeeva, 2012). Drawing conclusion from studied material, we distinguish the following periods in the research history of Orhon Inscriptions:

- (1) The first period from 1678 to 1893 captures the discovery of monuments and specially organized expeditions to study above-mentioned monuments.
- (2) The second period from 1893 to 1945 in the history of Old Turkic Inscriptions research is concerned with deciphering of the unknown runic writings, reading and translations of the texts and different hypothesis about the origin of this runes.
- (3) In the next period of research history from 1945 to 1991 scholars studied and wrote the grammar of Old Turkic monuments and begun to study Turkic languages in comparative –historical aspect.
- (4) The last period of Old Turkic inscriptions research which begins from 1991 up to now is described as a post-soviet period because in this period Turkic republics got their independence and the scholars have started to study the Old Turkic Inscriptions in new aspects.

Consequently, in this paper we are going to give a detailed picture of each period and analyses of the research works on the language of inscriptions in linguistic aspect in our own way. Before starting with research history periods, we would like to give the description of the texts of inscriptions.

Description of Orhon Old Turkic texts.

Orhon Inscriptions consist of big texts Kultegin, Ongin, Bilge Kagan, Tonykuk monuments and other smaller texts (Kononov, 1979; Zholdasbekov, Sartkozhauly, 2007).

1. The monument of Kultegin is an epitaph devoted to a hero Kultegin, which narrates about his heroic campaigns, conquest and about Turkic tribes and people. Masters from Chinese Tan Dynasty established this monument to the leader of Turkic Khanate at the proposal of Bilge Kagan in 731, as it is stated in the inscription (Zholdasbekov, Sartkozhauly, 2007). This monument is situated in Central Mongolia, on the east bank of Orhon River. N. Yadrintsev discovered this Turkic-Chinese writing on a stela in 1889. In 1890 a Finnish researcher A. Geikel and in 1891 Russian scientist V.Radlov made an estampage copy of the monument. After the deciphering of Runic alphabet by V. Thomsen, V. Radlov was the first scholar who made the transcription and translation of the Kultegin inscription (Sartkozhauly, 2012).

2. The monument of Bilge Kagan, which is situated on the east side of Orhon River in Mongolia, is similar to Kultegin monument. The turkologists assume this monument was written in 683-734 (Kononov, 1979). In this text, the author tells about the Turkic governors, political affairs and historical events. The monument of Bilge Kagan was discovered and studied at the same time with Kultegin inscription.

3. The next big text of Orhon Inscriptions is Tonykuk monument, situated in Tov region the Central part of Mongolia 60 km from Ulan Bator. This monument established in honor of Tonykuk dates in 712-716. Turkologists suppose the author of the text is Tonykuk himself. He was an important figure in Turkic Khanate, who was an advisor of three Khans in this Khanate. He is described as a wise man playing an important role in politics of the Khanate. The Tonykuk inscription was discovered in 1897 by E. Klements, a wife of D. Klements, who was in the political exile. V. Radlov published the transcription and translation of the text in 1899 (Zholdasbekov, Sartkozhauly, 2007).

4. Ongin monument an epitaph of army leader Alp El Etmish was established nearly between 700-716. It is situated in Ovorhangai region 30 km. from Arvahaityr town in Mongolia. N. Yadrintsev discovered it in 1891 and V. Radlov published the text in 1895, afterwards research works of H. Orkun [6], S. Malov [7], T. Tekin [8], G. Clausson [9] and others was published.

5. The monument of Culli Chur a leader Tardush tribe, who died in 721. V. Kotvitch discovered it in Ihe-Hushety steppe in 1921 (Zholdasbekov, Sartkozhauly, 2007).

6. Moiun Chur monument or a "Selenga Stone" found near the river Selenga in 1909 by G. Ramsted. The text was written nearly in 744-759 in the honour of the first leader of Uigur Dynasty Moiun Chur, who conquered the last Khan of Turkic Khanate Ozmish Tegin in 745 (Zholdasbekov, Sartkozhauly, 2007).

The word 'chur' with the meaning of 'leader', 'warrior' was used as title of higher administration, military rank. The language of the monument is Uihgur and it differs from the language of other monuments.

7. Sudgin inscription was discovered in 1909 by G. Ramsted (Sartkozhauly, 2012).

On the history of the research of old Turkic Orhon Inscriptions

8. Inscription from Hoito-Tamyr is an example of runic cursive writing copied by D. Klements (Kononov, 1979).

9. Inscription from Ihe-Ashete studied by S. Malov [7], H.N.Orkun [6] .

11. Inscriptions on a silver bowl found on the northeast side of the Tuul River in Mongolia in 2009. In 2011 Japan turkologists T. Osowa, K. Suzuki and Mongolian scientist G. Lhundev gave the description of the writing on a silver bowl in the paper (T. Osawa and others,2011)

12. Inscriptions on the dombyra (a musical instrument) found in Nuhen-had cave in Zhargalant Kairkhan mountains in Mongolia in 2007. In 2009 German scholars published an article about the dombyra inscriptions (Batsukh and others, 2009).

1. Discovery and presentation of monuments to the world of science.

The discovery of the monuments is associated with the expeditions organized by East and West Siberia Geographical society of Russian Empire the territory of Siberia, Mongolia and Central Asia. On the instructions of the society, the scholars of Russian Empire conducted research works to study the territory and draw the scheme of this territory. Besides this, scholars collected materials on language, culture and traditions of people living in Siberia, Mongolia and Central Asia. For this purpose, Russian Empire begun to send travelers, archeologists and scholars to above-mentioned territories. One of those was a Dutch traveler N. Vidzen (1641-1717) who first came to Moscow to collect materials on Russia. Afterwards he made a travel to Siberia and collected materials on Siberian people, their language and traditions. As a result of this travel he published his book about Far East (Russia's Far East) in 1692 and in 1695 he published the second book "The North and the Eastern Tatars". In his letters to the president of the Royal Society of Great Britain Sir R. Southwell, he wrote about pictures and unknown writing on the stones and the people of that place call the territory 'Bitig tas' (the Stone of Bitig) (Sartkhozhauly, 2012).

The next scholar who wrote about unknown signs on the stones was the Russian geographer, ethnographer S.Remezov. He made an expedition to draw the scheme of the Siberia. In his book "The drawing book of Siberia", he mentioned about Orhon stones.

At the end of the XVIII c. Peter the Great adopted resolution on collecting and preservation of historical values. Accordingly, he invited scholars from Europe to conduct research works. Among those scholars was Daniel Gottlieb Messerschmidt. He was a doctor, a botanist, and a linguist. As a result of his expedition to Mongolia, West Siberia lasted for seven years he gathered materials on history, language, ethnography, geography, botanics. In his works, he gave a lot of information about runic inscriptions in Siberia.

A Sweden officer, who was exiled to Siberia and spent twelve years, Philip Johan von Strahlenberg left important facts on the history, language, traditions, archeology and ancient monuments of Siberian people. He captured all these information in his books "A new geographical reference book of the Great Tataria (they called Turkic people Tatars)" and "The North and East part of". All these scholars named the unknown inscriptions 'runes' as well as they were similar to Scandinavian Runic inscriptions.If we take into consideration primitive information in the works of eastern scientist Atamalik Zhuveini wrote about the Orhon manuscripts found in the territory of Mongolia in the XIII c.

Orhon Runic writing monuments was discovered and presented to the whole world by Russian scientist N. M. Yadrintsev, who came across with these monuments during his travel to Mongolia on the instructions of East and West Siberia Geographical society. N. M. Yadrintsev declared that he had found Chinese hieroglyphs and runic writings similar to the Yenissei runes in Mongolia. In the result of expedition, he made copies of unknown writing and introduced them to the world of science, since that Orhon monuments have been an object of research. The earliest period of Orhon-Yenissei monuments research history captures the discovery and presentation of monuments to the world of science.

Recently discovered Orhon monuments are inscriptions on a silver bowl found on the north-east side of the Tuul river in Mongolia in 2009 and inscriptions on the dombyra (a musical instrument) found in Nuhen-had cave in Zhargalant Kairkhan mountains in Mongolia in 2007. In 2011 Japan turkologists T. Osowa, K. Suzuki and Mongolian scientist G. Lhundev gave the description of the writing on a silver bowl in the paper (Osowa and others, 2011) and in 2009 German scholars published an article about the dombyra inscriptions (Sartkhozhauly, 2011).

2. Deciphering the unknown runes and discussions on the origin of runes.

After the discovery and presentation of monuments researches tried to identify the inheritants of this monuments and decipher the runes. In 1889 the East Siberia department of Russian Geographic Society organized an expedition to Mongolia. V.V. Radloff conducted research works in the territory of Mongolia to decipher the runes in 1891. However, his attempt was not fruitful. As runic writings was not deciphered for a long time, different hypotheses were told about it. Some scientists supporting the hypothesis about original concernment to Greece culture and the others held to different opinions relating it to old Mongolian, old Finnish, Scythian and Slavonic writings failed in deciphering the manuscripts. Finally, the runic scripts were deciphered by V. Thomsen, a Danish scholar and professor of Copenhagen University, on the 25th of May 1893. V. Thomsen made a report about it at the conference of Royal Academy of Science of Denmark, which made a great impression on scientists of the world on 15 December of the same year. In his report, V. Thomsen declared that it was written in protolanguage of Turkic languages. The first words he had read were «täŋri» and «türk». Soon V. Radloff read the whole text with the help of Thomsen's method, after which he made the translation of monuments.

The monuments found in Mongolia were epitaph written on stelae of Bilge Kagan (also known as Mogilian), the 17th Kagan of East Turkic Khanate and his brother, military commander Kultegin. Later not far from this region, along the Selenga river the stele of Tonikuk, a wise adviser of three Turkic Kagans, was found by the brothers Klemens.

The next problem that scholars had hot discussions was the origin of Turkic runes. There were three different hypotheses about the origin of Turkic runes: 1. Aramaic, 2. Sogdian, 3. Original Turkic runic alphabet (Sartkhozhauly, 2012). The Aramaic origin of Turkic runes was offered by V. Thomsen and supported by O. Donner, P. Millioransky, A. Cherbak. G. Klosson, V. Levshits and S. Klyashtorny took its beginning from Sogdian alphabet (Klyashtorny, Levshits, 1978). According to the hypothesis of N. Aristov 29 symbols of Orhon runes out of 38 are similar to Turkic signs and 20 of them to signs of Kazakh tribes (Aristov, 1896). Nowadays this last hypothesis found its supporters among Turkologists. A Kazakh Turkologist Kh. Sartkhozhauly offers an opinion that Old Turkic

Runic alphabets were originated on the basis of world-view philosophy of Old Turks (Sartkhozhauly,2012).

Orhon-Yenissei texts of Old Turkic monuments were read and translated by V.Radloff, V. Thomsen, U. Nemmet and X. Orkun. Specially a well-known Russian scientist S. Malov made a great contribution to the preparation and translation of scientific texts. He paid a special attention to the right translation of texts (Shaimerdinova, 2009). Famous Turkologists M. Zholdasbekov and Kh. Sartkozha in their work “The Atlas of Orhon Monuments” published in 2005, presented the whole texts with transcription and translation by correcting mistakes of the previous works of other scholars (Zholdasbekov, Sartkozhauly, 2007).

3. Studies on grammar of monuments and comparative -historical studies of Turkic languages.

Furthermore, scientists begun to study the language and grammar of the Old Turkic monuments. We want to point out that the language of Orhon Manuscripts were studied as a part of Old Turkic language, there are few works on the grammar of Orhon texts. A group of scientists working on the grammar of runic writings studied phonetic system and morphological structure of manuscripts. A great contribution made to this field of investigation are the works of V. Radloff, P. Millioransky, V.Bartold, F.E. Korsh (Amanzholov, 2003). P.M. Mellioransky devoted his work to the language and semantic features of Old Turkic manuscripts and V. Bartold interprets the historical and cultural importance of these inscriptions. Besides V. Radloff, who paid a special attention to typological peculiarities of old language, distinguished the root and functions of word forming and inflectional suffixes. In 30-40s of XX century, the research works on Old Turkic language took a new direction after H.N. Orkun’s work on historical-comparative grammar of Turkic languages (Shaimerdinova, 2009). During the Soviet Union the works of Russian scholars as E.R. Tenishev, A. Kononov and N. Baskakov have an important place in Turkological studies. While E.R. Tenishev conducted detailed studies on dialect system of old turkic language (Tenishev, 1976), A. Kononov worked on phonology of roots and word formation in old language (Kononov, 1979) and N. Baskakov studied phonetic features of old monuments (Baskakov, 1939).

Kazakh scientists’ works as G. Aydarov, A. Amanzholov, M. Tomanov are considered to be a valuable scientific works on grammar and lexicology of old manuscripts. These scholars begun their research during the Soviet period and some of them continued their work in the post-soviet period. G. Aidarov was the first Kazakh turkologist who studied the language and grammar and published a book “The language of Orhon Monumnets” (Aidarov,1971). In addition, he devoted research works to separate Orhon monuments as Kultegin and Tonykuk. In his works, he gives the transcription, translation of texts and description of morphology, lexicology and word formation of the language of monuments. The work of A. Amanzholov on the derivation of verbs in Old Turkic language is important in reconstruction of historical verb roots and suffixes.

In the graphics system of Orhon and Yenissei monuments alphabet there are 31 letters, which stands for 16 consonant phonemes and phoneme variants. Five of them *z, m, ŋ, p, č* phonemes are defined by individual signs with some variants, while eleven of them *b, γ-g, d, j, q-k, l, n, r, s, t, š* are given by polyphone signs with two soft and hard variants. Besides there are four signs which define compound consonants: *rt, lt* are given by mono-phonemic signs, *nt, nč* are given by polyphone signs. A. Amanzholov states that the last

above-mentioned phonemic signs are used both for hard and soft consonants (Amanzholov, 2012).

The scholars of Turkey made a great contribution to the research of the language and grammar of Old Turkic manuscripts. We can point out the works of M. Erdal on grammar and word formation of Old Turkic language. As a Korean turkologist, Kim An-Lim states “Erdal’s “Old Turkic Word Formation”, a work with second title “A functional approach to the lexicon”, has revealed the meanings of numerous derivational markers. It explains the grammatical and functional behaviors of various formatives” (An-Lim, 2011:3), M. Erdal used different approach to word formation analysis as far as other scholars used traditional one, morphemic-structural approach (Erdal, 1991). M. Erdal in his work on Old Turkic grammar gives analyses of phonetics, morphology and syntactics of The Old Turkic and its relation to Altaic language family (Erdal, 1991). Besides the works of Ch. Aiylmaz “The word stock of Orhon Inscriptions”, in which he gives consideration to roots, derivations and word-forming suffixes (Aiylmaz, 2004) and the work of M. Olmez on semantics of borrowings in Old Turkic inscriptions (Olmez, 1995).

4. Post-soviet period: studying the inscriptions in the new aspects of linguistics.

The language of Orhon inscriptions are studied as a valuable material evidence in reconstruction of proto-Turkic language. Besides in modern Turkological studies, the research of the Old Turkic monuments are conducted in the aspect of anthropocentrism, which means to research the language in consequence with history, culture and worldview of ethnos.

In modern Kazakh Turkology the works of B. Sagyndykuly, Zh. Mankeeva and M. Yeskeeva investigating the monosyllabic system, historical development of lexis and the nature of root words of Old Turkic language are valuable in historical-comparative studies of Turkic languages. In the work of M. Yeskeeva, the author describes the structural features and etymology of monosyllabic roots and gives the phonological, lexical-semantic analyses of *V, VC, CV, CVC, VCC, CVCC models* of monosyllables in Orhon monuments and in modern Kipchak group of Turkic languages. In accordance with linguistic data, scholars have found that the CVCC model is the latest phenomenon in Turkic languages. On the basis of structural paradigm and semantic derivation of monosyllables in the language of the Old Turkic inscriptions and modern Kipchak group of Turkic languages the historical development of monosyllables is assumed as the followings(Yeskeeva,2007):

- (1) CVC VC
- (2) V VC CVC VC CVCC
- (3) VCC CV

B. Sagyndykuly gives detailed analyses of phonetic-historical changes in lexis, consonant correspondence and the historical development of this consonant correspondence. Based on the law of phonological development, articulation and acoustic features of Turkic languages and linguistic data he suggests that the old Turkic *j* phoneme is developed (comes from) T [s/š] a complex affricate gives the progression of phonemes as followings: *tš~ts~ti ~di~dž dz~t's'~d'z'~t~d~s~z~ š~ ž ~i~h~□ ~q~k~γ~g~s'~z'~t'~d'~o*. For example in Kultegin inscription *jat* «to lie», *jaz* «summer», *jol* «road», *joq* «no» (Aidarov, I, 211-213) ~ in Kazakh, Karakalpak *žat, žol, žaz, žoq* but in Nogai language which belong to this group of languages *jat, jaz, jol* and the old Turkic *j*

On the history of the research of old Turkic Orhon Inscriptions

phoneme is preserved in Oguz, Karluk group of Turkic languages etc. (Sagyndykuly, 2004).

As anthropocentrism became widely used in the world of science, this gave a rise to requisite for investigating the texts in a new way. It means to research a language in consequence with history, culture and worldview of ethnos. N. Shaimerdinova, a Kazakh Turkologist, expressed outlandish ideas about Old Turkic worldview in consequence with the language of Orhon monuments.

Recently, in post -soviet Russian Turkology historical-comparative research works on the reconstruction of Proto-Turkic and defining the place of Turkic languages in Altaic family of languages are related to Old Turkic inscriptions. In the result of investigations, the Russian scientists published book on historical- comparative grammar, historical-comparative morphology and historical-comparative lexicology of Turkic languages. In this field scholars as A. Dybo, D. Kormushin and O. Mudrak made a great contribution.

The comparative methodology, still successful used in the humanities, allowed to classify in due time language families, on the basis of their genealogical relationship, similarity of their language systems (in the material sphere of a language sign - phonetic / a phonologic subsystem, and also in grammar system). The Altaic family of the languages allocated in the specified way is not an exception.

Along with it there is a hypothesis of the Ural-Altai family of languages in which a large number of the Ural-Altai lexical parallels testifying to areal contacts of the Altai and Ural protoethnoses during the most ancient eras is established. The key Proto-Uralic-Altai ethnocultural ties mentioning the sphere of the nature, flora and fauna, occupation, ritual traditions and clothes, are revealed by A.V.Dybo. The theory the Altai family of languages causes ambiguous judgments. On the one hand, there is a conceptual theory scientific altaic studies, with another - the absence of proof of relationship of the Altai languages is approved, it is considered that the Altai community is caused by areal and typological convergences, the community of lexemes in the Altai languages is defined as the loans resulting long ethnocultural contacts.

Anna Dybo along with other scientists such as B. Ya. Vladimirtsov, G. Ramsted, N.N.Popp, E.D.Polivanov, V.L.Kotvich M. Pello, A. Gabin, A.Rona-Tash, D. Shinor, T.Tekin, M. Ryasyanen, I.V.Kormushin, O.A.Mudrak, represents a position of positive Altaic theory.

A.V.Dybo's merit, that it managed to reveal in Altaic studies a new level of knowledge to reconstruct 'deep language system', to recreate parent language basis, praaltaysky language in which found compliances Turkic, Mongolian, Tungus-Manchurian, Korean and Japanese parent languages at levels phonetic, lexical, grammatical and on the basis of language data to define Paleo-culture and an ancestral home of Altaians. Having defined prepotent key concepts of pro-altaic culture of A.V.Dybo, recreates the general archetype of specified Paleo-Culture. Focus of these concepts is reduced to designation in landscape language (mountains and slopes, valleys and steppes, the rivers, lakes, the seas); climate; flora, characteristic for accommodation of praaltayets (coniferous and broad-leaved trees, bushes, wild cereals, hemp and a worm wood - from here and conclusions of the author: 'the ancestral home of the Altai people was in a border area of the southern taiga and the steppe'); detailed gender and age terminology for wild hoofed animals (sejgo 'male' of a deer, an antelope; zunti 'female of an elk / camel', etc.), designation of large and average predators; hunting and fishing terminology; seasonal and pasturable cattle breeding; the terms connected with riding (as a special nomadic sign); dairy and meat food; the

dwelling, relationship terms (existence cross-causin marriage, terms for wives, indicating polygamy), the weapon and religious terminology.

Identification and the characteristic of the main paleo-cultural lexemes allows to build a conceptual semantic field by means of which it is possible to interpret a conceptual and language picture of the world of the Altaic people in an extreme antiquity. Deserves special attention of research of the scientist in the field of historical phonetics and morphology. A.V. Dybo reconstructs proto Altaic vocalism, reconstructs its disharmony system: *i, *e, *, *o, *a with three diphthongs meeting only in the first syllable (*ii, *io, *ia). By means of reception - impact of vocalism of a non-first syllable on vocalism of the first syllable the scientist reconstructs parent languages of separate groups of the Altai family: proto languages and others. Distinctive feature of vocalism Altai, in particular, Proto-Turkic and Pro-Mongolian languages is harmony of vowels depending on a combination to guttural and palatalized consonants. Vowel harmony observed in modern Turkic (including Kazakh) languages, reveals their historical links with Proto-Turkic language.

The important place in the reconstruction of historical phonology of proto - languages is taken by reconstruction of system of a consonantism, detection of its features (a reduction of phonologic systems in anlaud, restrictions on compatibility of phonemes and a tendency to an open syllable), studying of the morphonological phenomena (a compression and the simplification of combinations leading to reduction of phoneme structure of a root: stop consonant+stop consonant, sonant+stop, stop+sonant, sonant+sonant). A.V. Dybo investigates not only historical phonetic alternations in structure of the Proto-Altaic, Proto-Turkic word, but also, focusing attention on morphonological processes in these proto languages, defines pre-agglunatative condition of the Proto-Altaic word, shows that it isn't simple to draw lines between root and affixal morphemes. According to A.V.Dybo, for a Proto-Altaic state it is characteristic a homonymity of roots, a root union with affixal elements that complicated allocation of semantics of an affix; the impression was made that the major lexical meaning bears not a root, and an affix. Really, these phenomena were observed in the Proto-Turkic roots: ke/ki; to; qo; ja; jo (j ö /ju/jü) and many others at connection with consonant became eaningful: ke+l 'come'; ke+s 'cut'; ke+t 'leave'; ki+r 'enter'; to+j 'be sated', 'feast'; to+q 'full'; to+z 'be exhausted'; 'to put' qo+d (d/□/j); ja+n 'burn'; 'to light' ja+q; jo+r 'go'. The stop and sonorant consonants which initially weren't entering into structure of a root, allocated with grammatical meanings of an affix, form a new root basis on the C+V+C model later. Therefore, in Turkic languages root morphemes phonetic unchangeable later were created: - kel, - ket, - kir, - toj, - qod/qo /qoj, - jor/jö r/jur/jür, etc.

The homonymy of roots noted by A.V.Dybo proceeds from a syncretism of verbal-nominal bases, or the verbal-nominal homonymy covering all prototurkic period: *žar* 'dissect', *žar* 'darling/friend/girlfriend'; 'to be sated' with that, that 'feast'; *tij* 'breath', *tij* 'to have a rest'; *oi* 'thoughts/thoughts', *oi* 'hollow/hole'; *köš-* 'movement', *köš-* 'to move/wander', etc. The verbal-nominal homonymy remained during an Old Turkic period and there were unproductive modern times though some relic phenomena meet in Turkic languages still. So, for example, in modern Kazakh language are observed a semantic allomorphy in homoforms: *qoi-* 'sheep', *qoi* 'put'; *at* 'horse', *at* 'shoot', etc.

Conclusion

In the history of research of Orhon Old Turkic monuments, the following periods of research can be distinguished in accordance with the aspects of studies and historical events:

- a) The first period from 1678 to 1893 captures the discovery of monuments and specially organized expeditions to study above-mentioned monuments.
- b) The second period from 1893 to 1945 in the history of Old Turkic Inscriptions research is concerned with deciphering of the unknown runic writings, reading and translations of the texts and different hypothesis about the origin of this runes.
- c) In the next period of research history from 1945 to 1991 scholars studied and wrote the grammar of Old Turkic monuments and begun to study Turkic languages in comparative – historical aspect.
- d) The last period of Old Turkic inscriptions research which begins from 1991 up to now is described as a post-soviet period because in this period Turkic republics got their independence and the scholars have started to study the Old Turkic Inscriptions in new aspects.

Each period is distinguished for particular research aspects the scholars addressed to inscriptions' language. Consequently, research works conducted on the linguistic aspect of the language of the Old Turkic Monuments in each period were fruitful and made a great contribution to Turkological Studies. However, there are few works devoted to Orhon Inscriptions separately, the language of the monuments, as the earliest valuable written data, are studied in Old Turkic language research works, Altaic language family studies and in reconstruction of Proto-Turkic and Proto-Altaic languages.

REFERENCES

- Saurykov, Y.* (2014) Secrets of the Runic Monuments found in Central Asia. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 122, 167 – 171
- Yeskeeva, M.* (2011) *Linguo-philosophical Basis of Old Turkic Written Monuments.* Astana: Saryarka.
- Kononov, A.N.* (1980) *Грамматика языка тюркских рунических памятников (The Grammar of the Language of the Old Turkic Runic Inscriptions).* L: Nauka
- Zholdasbekov, M., Sartkhozhauly, K.* (2005) *Atlas of Orhon Monuments.* Astana:Kultegin
- Sartkhozhauly, K.* (2012) *Orhon monuments.* Almaty:Abzal-ai
- Orkun, H.N.* (1986) *Eski Türk Yazıtları.* Istanbul
- Malov, S.E.* *Памятники древнетюркской письменности (тексты и исследование).* – М.-Л., 1951. (Monuments of Old Turkic Writing (texts and research works). М.-Л.: 1951)
- Tekin, T.* (1983) *Küzey Mogolistanda yeni bir Uğur anıtı:Tarayat kitabesi.*Ankara:Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Clauson, Sir Gerard* (1972) *An Etimological dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth Century Turkish.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Torbat, T. and others.* (2009) *A Rock Tomb of the Ancient Turkic Period in the Zhargalant Khairhan Mountains, Khovd Aimag, with the Oldest Preserved Horse-Head Fiddlein Mongolia – A Preliminary Report // Current Archeological Research in Mongolia.* Bonn, 365-383.
- Sartkhozhauly, K.* (2010) *The Old Dombyra.*<http://www.tilop.kz>.
- Klyashtorny, S., Levshits V.* (1978) *Discovery and research Old Turkic and Sogdian Epigraphic Monuments.* Archeologia i etnographia Mongolii. Novosibirsk.

- Aristov, N.* (1896) Notes on Ethnic Composition of Turkic Tribes and People and Population Record. ZhS 3-4, 277-456
- Shaimerdinova, N.* (2009) Representation in the Language of Old Turkic Worldview. Astana.
- Amanzholov, A.* (2003) History and theory of Old Turkic manuscript. "Mektep" Press
- Tenishev, E.* (1976) About Supradialectual Character of the Language of Old Turkic Runic Inscriptions. Turkologica. Devoted to the 70 anniversary of academician A.N. Kononov, 164-172
- Lim, A.K.* (2011) The meaning structure of the Old Turkic denominal verb formatives. Part1. *Turkic Languages* 15, 3-50
- Erdal, M.* (1991) Old Turkic Word Formation. Weisbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Aiyılmaz, C.* (1994) Orhun Yazıtlarında Söz Dizimi. Doktora Tezi. Ankara
- Olmez, M.* (1995) Eski Türk Yazıtlarında Yabancı öğeler (1). *Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları* 5, 227-229
- Aidarov, G.* (1971) The Language of Orhon Old Turkic Monuments of VIII c. Almaty: Nauka.
- Amanzholov, A.* (2009) The History An Experience on Turkic Languages Studies. Astana: Foliant.
- Sagyndykhov, B.* (2004) Phonology of the Development of Lexis in Turkic Languages. Almaty: Kazakh Universiteti
- Yeskeeva, M.* (2007) Monosyllabic Basis Old Turkic and Modern Kipchak Languages. Almaty: Arys Press.
-